

**REMARKS**

I.     Specification:

The Applicants amended claim 1, by adding the words “the wrapping is a sealed envelope”. The basis for this amendment is to be found on page 4, lines 2 to 5 and lines 23-27 of the specification.

The Applicants amended claim 4, by adding the words “and sealed” and “so as to obtain a sealed envelope”. The basis for this amendment is to be found on page 4, lines 2-5.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102: The examiner had rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,700,036 to Smith III. (“the Smith, III patent”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiners interpretation of the Smith III patent, and the applicant’s claim.

The applicant’s invention concerns a wrapped-card assembly comprising a data-encoded card enclosed in a wrapping. The data encoded card comprises confidential and non-confidential information in a visible form. The wrapping is made of a single material. The wrapping comprises

- an opaque area which covers at least partially the confidential information ; and
- a transparent area which covers at least partially the non-confidential information.

The wrapping is a sealed envelope. According to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (ISBN 0-19-860575-7) a sealed envelope is arranged for “completely enclosing a document”.

The Smith III patent discloses a wrapping comprising front and rear sheets placed in substantial congruent relation. The wrapping further comprises three sides 12, 13 and 14 that are continuously sealed, leaving a fourth side open to form a pocket between the front sheet and the rear sheet and to allow repeated insertion and removal of an insert (col 4, lines 42-46).

Therefore, the Smith III patent does not disclose a wrapping that is in the form of a sealed envelope.

Having a sealed envelope according to applicant's invention, which is still in its sealed state, provides the proof that nobody else has already read the confidential information (Applicant's specifications, page 4, lines 1-12).

Contrary to applicant's invention, the Smith III patent teaches that the fourth side has to remain open so as to allow repeated insertion and removal of the insert 8 (Smith III, col. 4, lines 42-46). Therefore, when reading the Smith III patent, an artisan of ordinary skill in the art would not sealed the fourth side.

None of the cited references do disclose a wrapping made of a single material which is a sealed envelope.

For this reason claim 1, claim 4 and all their dependant claims should not be rejected neither under 35 USC §102, as being anticipated by the Smith III patent, nor under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Smith III in view the cited references.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, the rejections under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Applicants request that this application be allowed to issue as a patent.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard W. Pojunas  
Reg. No. 30,314

SchlumbergerSema Inc.  
30000 Mill Creek Avenue, Suite 100  
Alpharetta, Georgia 30022  
Phone: (678) 258-1605  
Fax: (678) 258-1686